

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

**RS, a minor, represented by and through
his parents and guardians, SS and TS,**

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 3:11-cv-0667-ST
OPINION AND ORDER

**DETECTIVE RICH MATRISCIANO, an
individual; JANE DOE, an individual;
CITY OF HILLSBORO, a municipal
corporation; BRENDA VOYTEK, an
individual; and OREGON DEPARTMENT
OF HUMAN SERVICES, a public body,**

Defendants.

Thomas Freedman, Jr.
Pearl Law LLC
312 N.W. 10th Avenue, Suite 201
Portland, Oregon 97209
Attorney for Plaintiff

Steven A. Kraemer
Leslie Anne Edenhofer
Hoffman Hart & Wagner, LLP
1000 S.W. Broadway, 20th Floor
Portland, Oregon 97205
Attorneys for Defendants Rich Matrisciano and
City of Hillsboro

Dirk L. Pierson
Department of Justice
Trial Division, Torts Section
1162 Court Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301
Attorney for Defendants Oregon Department of Human
Services and Brenda Voytek

SIMON, District Judge:

On October 25, 2011, Magistrate Judge Janice Stewart filed Findings and Recommendations in this case (doc. # 32). Judge Stewart recommended that the motion to dismiss filed by defendant Brenda Voytek (doc. # 20) be denied. No objections have been filed.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may “accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Stewart’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Stewart’s Findings and Recommendation (doc. # 32).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of December, 2011.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge